

as Governor from 1954 through 1958, and accompanied him to Washington during his service as a United States Senator from 1962 through 1966 after he won an election to complete the unexpired term of the late Senator Keith Thomson, during which the elder Senator Simpson was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, forcing his retirement from the Senate.

On once being nominated "Wyoming Woman of the Year," Mrs. Simpson said, "The Bible does say, 'Let your light so shine before men that may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.'"

Certainly, Lorna Kooi Simpson carried with her throughout her life a brilliant, far-reaching light. She was a genuine "Renaissance Lady." To reflect on her life is to marvel at the capacity of some men and women to live selflessly and abundantly beyond the imaginations of most of us, and we are all diminished by the death of this great Wyoming lady, as we are diminished by the death of any great person.

I trust that Senator SIMPSON, whom we admire, and for whom we have great affection, will find a rich and undiminishing solace in the memories of Mrs. Simpson, and in the assurance of the love of God that so infused and defined her life. To be sure, Lorna Kooi Simpson was, and is, a genuine reflection of the workmanship of a Loving Heavenly Father, and she is now at rest in an Eternal Home, not made with hands, in our Father's house, near at hand to the Lord whom she so dearly served throughout her life with every talent with which He had entrusted her.

My wife, Erma, and I extend our sympathy and our condolences to ALAN SIMPSON and all of his family in this hour of trial.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORATORIUM ON NEW WETLAND DELINEATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I introduced this week, with 10 cosponsors, a bill to safeguard the property rights of our Nation's farmers. The bill will establish a moratorium on new wetland delineations, until Congress has time to enact a new farm bill and to consider the wetlands issue on agricultural land in conjunction with that bill. This corresponds with the policy set here by this body in 1985 when we passed the antiswampbusting and antiswampbusting provisions that are on the books and are generally good pieces of legislation—now being abused, though, by faceless bureaucrats, who are trying to redetermine additional wetlands. Even though the prior determinations have fit into the farming patterns of individual farmers around the United States.

As you know, Mr. President, no less than four Federal agencies claim jurisdiction over the regulation of wetlands. Just think of how impossible it is for the family farmer of America to try to understand what four different Federal

agencies want him to do in regard to wetlands on his personal property and how that confounds him in making business decisions on the operation of his farm.

Those four agencies last year entered into a memorandum of agreement concerning wetlands delineation on agricultural land. Although the memorandum of agreement was intended to streamline the regulatory process, and it was meant to clarify the role of each agency, it has, however, increased the level of confusion and the level of frustration among the farmers affected by it. It has not made their life any easier. It may have well been the intention of the faceless bureaucrat, through that agreement, to make life easier, but it has not.

The delineation of wetlands on agricultural land has been, for a long period of time, a confusing proposition. On the other hand, the consequences of the delineations are very clear. The farmer, for instance, might alter a wetland without authorization from the Federal Government, and could potentially face civil penalties, criminal action, and loss of farm program benefits. Because the stakes are so very high, I think we have a responsibility in this Congress, as representatives of the people, representing a major industry in America, because the food and fiber chain, from producer to consumer, is 20 percent of our gross national product, and considering the importance of this industry and the millions of family farmers, independent entrepreneurs that make their living this way, because of all these reasons, we must ensure that the delineation process is accurate and that it is reasonable.

As I speak, Mr. President, new wetlands delineation are being conducted in the State of Iowa pursuant to the memorandum of agreement. It is just starting in the State of Iowa, but is going to cover every other State affected by agricultural wetlands. So even though it is of immediate impact in my State, in just a few months, this process will be going on throughout the country.

This is a process whereby these people, unknown to the individual farmers, take the individual soil survey maps and aerial photos of vegetation topography. From these they attempt to find, in areas where they have not already said there are wetlands, some other little bit of evidence of wetlands, in order to get more farmers under the regulatory umbrella and get more land within each farm under that umbrella of wetlands? Because the more wetlands determinations and the more of an opportunity for the bureaucrats to have some jurisdiction over private property they would not otherwise have jurisdiction over.

This is being done not with on-site farm inspections, not with the individual farmer right alongside the soil conservation personnel—remember, historically, for 60 or 70 years, there has been a very close relationship and

friendly relationship between the soil conservation people who are educating farmers to be better caretakers of our natural resources and the farmer wanting to do that and learning from that process.

That sort of consultation has promoted more benefit to the environment than any other one process I know from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In this current process, it has not been the usual close relationship, but it is in the back rooms, or in the laboratories around the individual States, where bureaucrats are going over these soil maps with this aerial photography to find other wetlands. And then send out a new map to the individual farmers with additional delineation of wetlands on it. At that point, you have wetlands whether you think they are wetlands or not and it is your job, as an individual farmer, then, at the appeals process to show that these really are not wetlands. And the burden of proof is on the back of the farmer.

This is kind of a way of saying, "You are guilty of having something that you did not even know you had," particularly if you have been farming this very land for a long period of time.

Well, we ought to inform the farmer of this process. The bureaucracy has not informed the farmer of the process. In fact, in my State, in Story County, IA, there was a meeting to discuss this whole process, but it was by invitation only.

Although it may be legitimate to have some further determination, it ought to involve the farmer and it ought to require that the bureaucrat making that determination at least visit the area and see with their own eyes what the situation might be. This would reinforce the close relationship we have had for six or seven decades between the soil conservation consultant, engineer, and the individual family farmer. I am talking about the family farm, not the big corporate farmer with the absentee landownership and some foreign manager taking care of the land.

This process is currently going on, so that farmers will soon be deprived of the right to farm their land or improve their property because a Federal bureaucrat decides that such activity interferes with a protected wetland.

Remember, we went through this process after we passed the antiswampbusting and antiswampbusting legislation in the 1985 farm bill. I do not, for the most part—not completely, but for the most part—I do not hear any individual farmers complain about that determination or the regulations that have followed that determination. That is because there was an open effort on the part of the bureaucracy to work with the farmers, to understand what the process is, to have input. But not now. The meetings in my State are by invitation only.

Now, I suppose it sounds like we are opposed to protecting valuable wetlands. Well, I think the litmus test of that is our vote for the antiswampbusting, antisodbusting provisions in the 1985 farm bill. There were no efforts to repeal those provisions. In fact, even in the 1990 farm bill, there was some expansion in this area.

But I think we ought to be cognizant of the fact that it is not good for agriculture, it is not good for our general economy, and it surely is not conducive to the family farmer. He should not be expected to confront a faceless bureaucrat every so often, with changes in the rules every few years, so that farmers can never be certain if their conduct is allowed under the current regulatory scheme.

I am also opposed to the promulgation of a memorandum of agreement by four Federal agencies that will significantly affect the ability of private property owners to improve their land without the benefit of input from the people affected by the agreement.

My bill basically accomplishes two things. First, it will allow those property owners affected by the memorandum of agreement to have some input through congressional hearings on the wetlands policy. At the very least, Congress should ensure that the concerns of the private owners are heard before they are deprived of the use of their land.

The second purpose of the bill is to stop the bureaucracy from acting based upon the flawed memorandum of agreement. It is my sincere hope that this Congress will reform Federal wetlands policy. This policy should be based upon sound science, recognize the constitutionally protected right of private property, and, above all, institute a large dose of common sense into the program.

And where a real opportunity to instill common sense into this program was missed by the bureaucracy, is when the agreement was not promulgated under the Administrative Procedures Act. That process allows the publishing of whatever the bureaucrat wants to regulate, but it institutes upon them a discipline and a hearing process to make sure that there is input from all segments of the regulated community.

Now, in my State, we do not try to sneak things over on the people. This process of ignoring public input is foreign to the thinking of the common-sense approach of mid-Americans who are law-abiding citizens, who want to work with their Government, who want to keep the economy or the environment sound.

And so I beg for 6 months to slow the process down, to alert the family farmers of America to what is going on. That it is affecting their right to farm, and to do it in a businesslike fashion, and to allow the Agriculture Committee, under the extremely capable leadership of Senator LUGAR, to review this whole process and to work it into the

farm bill. That is just 6 months. Surely there is nothing wrong with that. Nothing is going to happen in the next 6 months that is going to be catastrophic to this whole process. I think that it is a commonsense approach.

So this bill stops the Government from finding new wetlands on farms until this reform can be put in place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

DEMOCRATS, GET REAL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful opinion piece by our colleague, the Senator from Maryland, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, January 22. She presents a road map that I believe can help all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, as we develop our priorities in this new Congress. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MIKULSKI's column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1995
DEMOCRATS, GET REAL
(By Barbara A. Mikulski)]

Democrats need a new attitude and action plan to focus on solving real problems. This attitude and plan must promote a shared national vision to create good jobs and give help to those who work hard, play by the rules and practice self-help. We need to create a new state of mind that—as Americans—we can solve our nation's problems together.

Democrats must stop being angst-addicted. We have too often substituted agonizing for action, and it has paralyzed us. To connect with middle-class Americans, we must think clearly and act decisively. Democrats must focus on the day-to-day needs of everyday Americans—their jobs, families and opportunities. We also need to look at our country's long-term needs. We need to generate jobs with pay worth the effort and education. We need to create a national readiness that is based on competence and character.

Democrats must focus on being politically effective, not necessarily politically correct. We cannot use words from a dated vocabulary. Political labels such as "right," "left," "liberal" and "conservative" have become clichés. Labels and stereotypes that go with them have little meaning.

Being politically effective means helping those who are middle class stay there or do better. Being politically effective means helping those who are not middle class get there through hard work and practicing self-help. Worn-out sound bites about the economy and crime weaken our credibility and play into the hands of those who demonize our ideas by blaming the victim, the government or both.

Democrats must figure out what works. We must be advocates for people and not automatically defend every government program. Let's look at the mission of these programs. When they serve their mission and help people, great. When they don't, let's get rid of them. We cannot be a rescue squad for every line item. Often, the good intentions of good people have gone astray. Tinker Toy reforms ultimately created other problems.

One example is federal housing policy. We thought that if we gave people housing, we would give them opportunity. Begun during the New Deal, most federal housing programs were meant to provide short-term shelter for people temporarily out of work. But a series of complicated rules and boutique programs has rewarded the wrong kind of behavior and made housing projects Zip codes of pathology. Few residents can find work. Crime and substance abuse are high.

Some blame the victim. Some identify with the victim. But Democrat's addition to other people's misery does not solve their problems or substitute for national policy. While we must acknowledge the pain of the impoverished, we must also require them to take charge of their own lives. We must find ways to reward those who work or get into a program for self-sufficiency.

We must ensure that welfare rules do not destroy the family. Democrats should stand up for the family—and that includes men. We need to end the "get the man out of the house" rule, which has pushed men out of the house so a family can qualify for public benefits. Shortsighted intentions have created rules that dismantle families, emasculate men and deny their children a full-time father. Being a dad is more than writing a child-support check.

We've heard a lot about angry voters. Actually, I think voters' anger stems from bewilderment and disillusionment. This bewilderment and disillusionment is based on the fact that their personal experience does not reflect what statistics tell them. People are told that they are fortunate to live in an economy of low unemployment, low inflation and rapid growth. Yet, people are one downsizing away from unemployment, their friends have been laid off, and their standard of living continues to decline. At the same time, people feel less secure in their homes, neighborhoods and workplaces. Children are killing children with guns carried around in school backpacks.

America's future deserves more thought and effort than partisan bidding wars over tax cuts. It deserves more than the pursuit of "faddish" ideas floated by think tanks. Americans deserve real solutions to the complex problems of an increasingly complex world.

Democrats must join together to create this new attitude, both within the Democratic Party and within the country—to reward hard work, family stability and playing by the rules. Together, we can begin to address the very valid concerns Americans have about their futures, the futures of their families and the future of their country.

AUSCHWITZ IS SYNONYMOUS WITH EVIL

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, perhaps more than any other word, Auschwitz is synonymous with evil.

Fifty years ago today, Russian soldiers liberated Auschwitz.

The horrors of Auschwitz are incomprehensible and undecipherable.

Over 1 million people lost their lives at Auschwitz—the largest of the Nazi death camps. Ninety percent were Jews. Hundreds of thousands were children.

Auschwitz represented the German's campaign to exterminate a people—the Jews. They almost succeeded—killing two out of three Jews in Europe.

As a Polish-American, I carry the images of Auschwitz in my heart.